arXiv:1302.1488v1 [math.LO] 6 Feb 2013

ON MAXIMAL CONSERVATIVE EXTENSIONS

HENRY TOWSNER

Abstract. We investigate the set of Π^1_2 sentences which are Π^1_1 conservative over the theories of reverse mathematics $\mathbf{RCA_0}+I\Sigma_n$ and $\mathbf{ACA_0}$. We exhibit new elements of these sets and conclude that the sets are Π_2 complete.

1. Introduction

Many questions in reverse mathematics amount to asking about the implications among Π^1_2 sentences over a fixed background theory. One aspect of calibrating the strength of these Π^1_2 sentences is asking what their first-order—that is, arithmetic—consequences are, and so a natural goal is to identify, for a given Π^1_2 sentence, what arithmetic sentences are needed to capture its arithmetic consequences. Phrased differently, we ask what Π^1_1 theory T is needed so that the sentence is Π^1_1-conservative over T.

Yokoyama [9] and, independently, Ikeda and Tsuboi [7], showed that when T is a Π^1_2 theory, there is a maximal Π^1_2 theory Π^1_1-MAX(T) which is Π^1_1 conservative over T. In the particular case where T is $\mathbf{RCA_0}$, three (families of) members of Π^1_1-MAX$(\mathbf{RCA_0})$ are known: weak König's lemma (due to Harrington), a version of the Baire Category Theorem [4], and the existence of cohesive sets [5]. Yokoyama asked whether these statements provided axioms for Π^1_1-MAX$(\mathbf{RCA_0})$.

In this paper we exhibit new elements of the theories Π^1_1-MAX$(\mathbf{RCA_0}+I\Sigma_n)$ and Π^1_1-MAX$(\mathbf{ACA_0})$ which suffice to show that these theories are Π_2 complete. In particular, this means the theories are not given by a finite number of axiom schemes.

2. Definitions

Throughout this paper, we consider theories in the language $\mathcal{L}^2$ of second-order arithmetic; all theories we consider will extend the standard base theory $\mathbf{RCA_0}$ (see [8]). All models will have the form $\mathfrak{M}=(M,\mathcal{M})$ where M is a model of first-order arithmetic and $\mathcal{M}\subseteq\mathcal{P}(|M|)$. (As the example suggests, we will write the Fraktur letter $\mathfrak{M}$ for the model, the Roman letter M for the first-order part, and the calligraphic letter $\mathcal{M}$ for the second-order part.) We write $|M|$ for the universe of M and $||M||$ for the cardinality of $|M|$.

Date: February 7, 2013.

Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1157580.

Definition 2.1. We say $\mathfrak{M}$ is *countable* if $||M|| = |\mathcal{M}| = \aleph_0$. We say $\mathfrak{M}$ is an *ω-submodel* of $\mathfrak{M}'$ if $M = M'$ and $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathcal{M}'$.

We follow the convention of using lower case letters to refer to elements of $|M|$ or numeric variables, and upper case letters for elements of $\mathcal{M}$ or set variables. In particular, when we write $\forall x\phi$, we mean x is a numeric variable, while $\forall X\phi$ indicates that X is a set variable.

Definition 2.2. Let $T \subseteq T'$ be theories in $\mathcal{L}^2$. We say T' is Π^1_1 *conservative* over T if whenever $T' \vdash \sigma$ and σ is a Π^1_1 sentence, already $T \vdash \sigma$.

We say a sentence σ is *true* if $(\mathbb{N}, \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})) \vDash \sigma$. A theory T is true if every sentence in T is true.

The most common way to show that some theory is Π^1_1 conservative is to show that it has the ω-extension property:

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose that every countable model of T is an ω-submodel of a model of T'. Then T' is Π^1_1 conservative over T.*

Cholak, Jockusch, and Slaman asked if, for Π^1_2 theories, this is the only way for a theory to be Π^1_1 conservative [5]. That is:

Question 2.4. *Suppose $T \subseteq T'$ are Π^1_2 theories extending $\mathbf{RCA_0}$, and that T' is a Π^1_1 conservative extension of T_0. Is it the case that every model of T is an ω-submodel of a model of T'?*

Avigad showed that the answer is no [1]; this was extended by Yokoyama [9], who showed that the answer is still no even if we require that T' be true. We will provide some additional examples below.

However Yokoyama [9] and Ikeda and Tsuboi [7] showed that, nonetheless, two distinct Π^1_2, Π^1_1 conservative extensions of T do have common models. More precisely:

Theorem 2.5. *Let T_0, T_1, T_2 be Π^1_2 theories such that T_1 and T_2 are Π^1_1 conservative extensions of T_0. Then $T_1 + T_2$ is a Π^1_1 conservative extension of T_0.*

By standard compactness arguments, if $T_0 \subseteq T_1 \subseteq \cdots$ and each T_i is Π^1_1 conservative over T_0, so is $\bigcup_i T_i$.

Definition 2.6. Π^1_1-MAX(T) is the collection of Π^1_2 sentences σ such that $T + \sigma$ is Π^1_1 conservative over T.

Corollary 2.7. *If T is a Π^1_2 theory then Π^1_1-MAX(T) is Π^1_1 conservative over T.*

3. Sets at Arm's Length

We work with some fixed internal bijective pairing function, $(\cdot,\cdot) : |M|^2 \to |M|$. For longer tuples we write $(\ldots, y, z)$ as an abbreviation for $((\ldots, y), z)$. When functions are understood to take tuples as their input, we will write $f(x, y, \ldots, z)$ instead of $f((x, y, \ldots, z))$.

Definition 3.1. If $X \in \mathcal{S}$, we say X is *convergent* if for each $i \in |M|$ there is an $m \in |M|$ such that for all $m' \geq m$, $(i, m') \in X$ iff $(i, m) \in X$. If X is convergent, we write

$$\lim X = \{i \mid \mathfrak{M} \vDash \exists m \forall m' \geq m\, (i, m') \in X\} = \{i \mid \mathfrak{M} \vDash \forall m \exists m' \geq m\, (i, m') \in X\}.$$

We define n-convergence and $\lim^n X$ recursively. Every X is 0-convergent and $\lim^0 X = X$. If X is n-convergent, we say X is $n+1$-convergent if $\lim^n X$ is convergent, and define $\lim^{n+1} X = \lim \lim^n X$.

Of particular importance is the fact that if $X \in \mathcal{M}$, the set $\lim^n X$ is Δ_{n+1} in $\mathfrak{M}$ using X as a parameter.

To actually build models, it is convenient to use the following standard result:

Theorem 3.2 (Friedman [6])**.** *If $\mathfrak{M}$ is a model of $I\Sigma_n$ then it is an ω-submodel of a model of $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$.*

Our main tool for proving results about Π^1_1-MAX($\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$) is the following theorem:

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\mathfrak{M} = (M, \mathcal{M})$ be a countable model of $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$, and let $S \subseteq |M|$. Then $\mathfrak{M}$ is an ω-submodel of some $\mathfrak{M}' = (M, \mathcal{M}')$ such that $\mathfrak{M}' \vDash \mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$ and there is some $X \in \mathcal{M}'$ with $\lim^n X = S$.*

In other words, while we cannot expect to add arbitrary sets to a nonstandard model (since such a set could easily violate induction), we can add descriptions of arbitrary sets as long as we "keep them at arm's length"—as long as the set is described only as a limit which is too complicated to be covered by the induction axioms in the underlying theory.

3.1. The $I\Sigma_1$ Case.

We first prove the case where $n = 1$ to illustrate the method. The main tool is a forcing argument based on the technique from [5]

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\mathfrak{M} = (M, \mathcal{M})$ be a countable model of $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_1$, and let $S \subseteq |M|$. Then $\mathfrak{M}$ is an ω-submodel of some $\mathfrak{M}' = (M, \mathcal{M}')$ such that $\mathfrak{M}' \vDash \mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_1$ and there is some $X \in \mathcal{M}'$ with $\lim X = S$.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.2, it suffices to show that there is an S such that $\lim S = W$ and for every Σ_1 formula $\phi(x, X)$ with parameters from $\mathfrak{M}$, induction holds for $\phi(x, S)$.

We prove this by forcing. Our conditions will be tuples $p = (\chi^p, I^p, V^p)$ where:

- χ^p_B is a $\{0,1\}$-valued function with bounded domain whose graph is in $\mathcal{M}$,
- I^p is finite,
- $V^p : I^p \to |M|$,
- Whenever $i \in I^p$, there is an $s \geq V^p(i)$ such that $\chi^p(i, s)$ is defined,

- If $i \in I^p$, $s, s' \geq V^p(i)$ and $\chi^p(i,s)$ and $\chi^p(i,s')$ are both defined then $\chi^p(i,s) = \chi^p(i,s')$.

We define ν^p to be the partial function such that:

- $\chi^p \subseteq \nu^p$,
- If $i \in I^p$ and $s \geq V^p(i)$ then $\nu^p(i,s) = \chi^p(i,s')$ where $s' \geq V^p(i)$ is such that $\chi^p(i,s')$ is defined.

We say $p' \preceq p$ if $\chi^p_B \subseteq \chi^{p'}_B$, $I^p \subseteq I^{p'}$, and $V^{p'} \upharpoonright I^p = V^p$. Note that this implies $\nu^p \subseteq \nu^{p'}$. We write $p' \preceq_0 p$ if $p' \preceq p$ and $I^p = I^{p'}$.

χ^p is an approximation to the characteristic function of the set X we ultimately built. I^p is a collection of points where we have fixed the value of the limit, and V^p is the point by which the limit has converged.

We consider formulas in the language $\mathcal{L}^2(G)$, given by expanding $\mathcal{L}^2$ with a fresh set constant G and constants for all parameters from $\mathfrak{M}$. It is convenient to restrict consideration to prenex formulas.

If ϕ is a Δ_0 formula in $\mathcal{L}^2(G)$, we say $p \Vdash \phi(G)$ if for every S such that $\chi_S \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(\nu^p) = \nu^p$, $\phi(S)$ holds. We say $p \Vdash \exists x \phi(x, G)$ if whenever $p' \preceq p$, there is some $p'' \preceq p'$ and some $m \in |M|$ such that $p'' \Vdash \phi(m, G)$. We say $p \Vdash \forall x \phi(x, X)$ if for every $m \in |M|$, $p' \Vdash \phi(m)$. Note that when ϕ is Δ_0, $p \Vdash \phi$ is a Δ_1 statement.

We will construct an infinite sequence of conditions $p_0 \succeq p_1 \succeq \cdots$ satisfying the following properties:

- If $p_j \Vdash \exists x \phi(x)$ where ϕ is Δ_0 then there is a $j' \in \mathbb{N}$ and a $k \in |M|$ such that $p_{j'} \Vdash \phi(k)$,
- For each Σ_1 formula $\phi(x)$ in $\mathcal{L}^2(G)$, either there is a j such that $p_j \Vdash \forall x \neg \phi(x)$ or there is a j and a $c \in |M|$ such that $p_j \Vdash \phi(c) \wedge \forall x < c \neg \phi(x)$
- For each $i \in |M|$, there is some j with $i \in I^{p_j}$ and $\chi^{p_j}(i, V^{p_j}(i)) = \chi_W(i)$.

We may break each of these properties up into countably many requirements. In most forcing arguments, we would show that the sequence satisfies all these properties by showing that each requirement is satisfied by a dense set of conditions. In order to avoid conflicts with the third property, however, we need slightly more: we need to show that the first two properties are dense with respect to $\preceq_0$, and only in order to satisfy the third property will we add elements to I^p.

The first set of requirements is easily handled: if $p \Vdash \exists x \phi(x)$ then there is a $q \preceq p$ and a k such that $q \Vdash \phi(k)$. Since forcing a Δ_0 statement is Δ_1, this depends on only boundedly many values of ν^q, so we may choose a $q' \preceq_0 p$ so that $\chi^{q'}$ agrees with ν^q on a large enough bounded subset so that $q' \Vdash \phi(k)$.

To satisfy the second family of requirements, let a condition p and some Σ_1 formula $\exists y \phi(x, y)$ be given. Consider the set of c such that there is some $q \preceq_0 p$ and some m such that $q \Vdash \phi(c, m)$. If there is no such c then we have

$p \Vdash \forall x \forall y \neg\phi(x,y)$, and we are finished. Otherwise, the set of such c is a Σ_1 set, so (since the ground model satisfies $I\Sigma_1$) there is a least such c, and so we may pass to some $q \preceq_0 p$ so that $q \Vdash \exists y \phi(c,y)$. It suffices to show that if $c' < c$, $q \Vdash \forall y \neg\phi(c',y)$; suppose not, so there is some $c' < c$, some $q' \preceq q$, and some m such that $q' \Vdash \phi(c',m)$. Then, since forcing a Δ_0 formula is a Δ_1 property, again there is a bounded portion of $\nu^{q'}$ witnessing this, and therefore there is a $q_0 \preceq_0 p$ so that $q_0 \Vdash \phi(c',m)$. But this contradicts the leastness of c.

The third set of requirements is satisfied by setting $I^q = I^p \cup \{i\}$, setting $V^q(i)$ to be larger than any element s with $\chi^p(i,s)$ defined, and setting $\chi^q(i, V^q(i)) = \chi_W(i)$.

We take $X = \{x \mid \exists i\ \nu^{p_i}(x){=}1\}$. We have that whenever $p_i \Vdash \phi(G)$ where $\phi(G)$ is Π_1 or Σ_1, $\phi(X)$ holds: when ϕ is Δ_0 or Π_1 this is immediate from the definition, and for Σ_1 formulas this is enforced by the first set of requirements. The second set of requirements ensures that Σ_1 induction holds for formulas including X as a parameter. The third set of requirements ensures that $\lim X = W$. □

3.2. **The General Case.** We now turn to the full proof of Theorem 3.3. Throughout this argument, we work with a fixed value n. To manage notation, we introduce the following shorthand: we write $\vec{s}_{[n,i]}$ for the finite sequence $s_n, \dots, s_i$. In particular, instead of writing $f(s_n, \dots, s_i)$, we will write $f(\vec{s}_{[n,i]})$.

Our forcing conditions will be tuples

$$p = (\chi^p, \{I^p_i\}_{i \leq n}, \{V^p_i\}_{i \leq n})$$

where:

- χ^p is a $\{0,1\}$-valued function with bounded domain whose graph is in $\mathcal{M}$,
- I^p_n is a finite set,
- For each i with $0 < i < n$, I^p_i is a bounded set of sequences of length $n - i + 1$ which is in $\mathcal{M}$,
- For each i with $0 < i \leq n$, $V^p_i : I^p_i \to |M|$ is a function in $\mathcal{M}$,
- (*Realization*) If $1 < i \leq n$ and $\vec{s}_{[n,i]} \in I^p_i$ then there is some $s_{i-1} \geq V^p_i(\vec{s}_{[n,i]})$ so that $\vec{s}_{[n,i-1]} \in I^p_{i-1}$,
- (*Realization*) If $\vec{s}_{[n,1]} \in I^p_1$ then there is some $s_0 \geq V^p_1(\vec{s}_{[n,1]})$ so that $\chi^p(\vec{s}_{[n,0]})$ is defined,
- (*Coherence*) If $m < n$, $\chi^p(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,0]})$ and $\chi^p(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}'_{[m,0]})$ are both defined, and for every $i \in [0,m]$, $(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,i+1]}) \in I^p_{i+1}$, $t_i \geq V^p_{i+1}(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,i+1]})$, and $(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}'_{[m,i+1]}) \in I^p_{i+1}$, $t'_i \geq V^p_{i+1}(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}'_{[m,i+1]})$, then
$$\chi^p(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,0]}) = \chi^p(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}'_{[m,0]}).$$

We say $q \preceq p$ if:

- $\chi^p \subseteq \chi^q$,

- For each i with $0 < i \leq n$, $I^p_i \subseteq I^q_i$ and $V^p_i \subseteq V^q_i$.

The only reason that that I^p_n has to be handled separately from I^p_i for $i < n$ is that I^p_n is required to be actually finite, while I^p_i is merely $\mathfrak{M}$-finite.

The coherence property requires some unpacking to understand. We start with I^p_1: we intend for X to be convergent, which means that for each s, there should be some v such that $\chi_S(s,m)$ is the same for all $m \geq v$. When $s = \vec{s}_{[n,1]} \in I^p_1$, this means we have decided that $v = V^p_1(\vec{s}_{[n,1]})$. Similarly, when $n = 2$, we also need $\lim S$ to be convergent, which means that for each s there should be some s_1 so that when $t_1 \geq s_1$, $(\lim S)(s, t_1)$ is the same for all $t_1 \geq s_1$, which in turn means that $\lim_{m\to\infty} \chi_S(s, t_1, m)$ converges to the same value for each $t_1 \geq s_1$ (though the point of convergence may itself depend on the choice of t_1).

To make this property easier to work with, we introduce some terminology. We say that a sequence $(s_n, \dots, s_0)$ is *convergent from m in p* if for every $i \in [0, m]$, $\vec{s}_{[n,i+1]} \in I^p_{i+1}$ and $s_i \geq V^p_{i+1}(\vec{s}_{[n,i+1]})$. The purpose of the realization property is to ensure that whenever $\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]} \in I^p_{m+1}$, there is some sequence $\vec{s}_{[n,0]}$ which is convergent from m in p. Coherence then states that whenever $(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,0]})$ and $(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t'}_{[m,0]})$ are both convergent from m and χ^p is defined on both, χ^p has the same value on both. Therefore whenever $\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]} \in I^p_{m+1}$, we define $\chi^p_*(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]})$ to be this uniquely defined value.

Note that whenever $\vec{s}_{[n,0]}$ is convergent from m in p, $\vec{s}_{[n,0]}$ is also convergent from every $m' \leq m$, and so $\chi^*_p(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}) = \chi^*_p(\vec{s}_{[n,m'+1]})$.

For any i with $0 \leq i \leq n$, we say $q \preceq_i p$ if $q \preceq p$ and for all $j > i$, $I^p_j = I^q_j$ (and therefore $V^p_j = V^q_j$). ($q \preceq_n p$ is simply $q \preceq p$.) When $q \preceq p$ we write $q \upharpoonright_i p$ for the condition with $\chi^{q \upharpoonright_i p} = \chi^q$ and $I^{q\upharpoonright_i p}_j = I^q_j$ if $j \leq i$ and $I^{q\upharpoonright_i p}_j = I^p_j$ if $j > i$. It is easy to check that $q \upharpoonright_i p$ is a condition and $q \upharpoonright_i p \preceq_i p$.

If $q, r \preceq p$, $q \preceq_i p$ and $r \upharpoonright_i p = p$, we define $q \cup r$ to be the condition with $\chi^{q\cup r} = \chi^q$, $I^{q\cup r}_j = I^q_j$ if $j \leq i$ and $I^{q\cup r}_j = I^r_i$ if $i < j$. Note that $q \cup r$ need *not* be a condition itself: for instance, when $i = 0$, r could include some new element $(\dots, s)$ in I^r_1 with $V^r_1(\dots, s) = v$, while χ^q could be newly defined on $(\dots, s, v+1)$ with a different value from $\chi^p(\dots, s, v)$. However the realization property sharply limits how r could expand and still satisfy $r \upharpoonright_{i+1} p = p$, so we have the following:

Lemma 3.5. *If $q \preceq_i p$ and $r \upharpoonright_{i+1} p = p$ then $q \cup r$ is a condition.*

Proof. We need only check the coherence property of $q \cup r$. Suppose $(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,0]})$ and $(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t'}_{[m,0]})$ are both convergent from $m < n$ and χ^q is defined on both. If $m \leq i$ then since the property of being convergent from m depends only on $I^{q\cup r}_j, V^{q\cup r}_j$ for $j \leq m+1$, both sequences were convergent from m in q, and therefore by the coherence of q, $\chi^{q\cup r} = \chi^q$ takes the same value on both.

So consider the case where $m > i$. Then since $(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,0]})$ is convergent from m, $(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,0]})$ must also be convergent from $i < m$, and

$(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,i+1]})$ must have already belonged to I^p_{i+1}, and so

$$\chi^r_*(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}) = \chi^r_*(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,i+1]}) = \chi^p_*(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,i+1]}).$$

But also $\chi^q_*(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,i+1]}) = \chi^p_*(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,i+1]})$, so in particular $\chi^q(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,0]}) = \chi^r_*(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]})$.

By a similar argument, $\chi^q(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}'_{[m,0]}) = \chi^r_*(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]})$, so we have

$$\chi^q(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}_{[m,0]}) = \chi^q(\vec{s}_{[n,m+1]}, \vec{t}'_{[m,0]})$$

as desired. □

We define ν^p to be a $\{0,1\}$-valued partial function in $\mathcal{M}$ such that:

- $\chi^p \subseteq \nu^p$,
- If $\vec{s}_{[n,1]} \in I^p_1$ then for any $s_0 \geq V^p_1(\vec{s}_{[n,1]})$, $\nu^p(\vec{s}_{[n,0]}) = \chi^p_*(\vec{s}_{[n,1]})$.

Clearly if $q \preceq p$ then $\nu^p \subseteq \nu^q$.

We define when a condition forces a formula. We again consider formulas from the language $\mathcal{L}(G)$, which extends $\mathcal{L}^2$ by constants for all elements of $\mathfrak{M}$ and a fresh set constant G. It will suffice to only consider formulas in prenex form.

- If ϕ is Δ_0, $p \Vdash \phi(G)$ if whenever $\chi_S \upharpoonright \mathrm{dom}(\nu^p) = \nu^p$, $\phi(S)$ holds,
- $p \Vdash \exists x \phi(x)$ if $\forall q \preceq p \, \exists r \preceq q \, \exists k \; r \Vdash \phi(k)$,
- $p \Vdash \forall x \phi(x)$ if $\forall k \; p \Vdash \phi(k)$.

When ϕ is in prenex form, we will abuse notation and write $\neg\phi$ for the prenex form of the negation.

It is easy to see that when ϕ is Δ_0, the set of p such that $p \Vdash \phi$ is Δ_1. We need to extend this so that the set of p forcing Σ_m or Π_m sentences, for $m < n$, is defined internally.

Lemma 3.6. *If $q \preceq p$ and $p \Vdash \phi$ then $q \Vdash \phi$.*

Proof. By induction on the complexity of ϕ. If ϕ is Δ_0, this is immediate from the definition. If ϕ is Π_{m+1}, this follows directly from the inductive hypothesis. If ϕ is a Σ_{m+1} formula $\exists x \psi(x)$, for any $q' \preceq q$, also $q' \preceq p$, so there is an $r \preceq q'$ and a k such that $r \Vdash \psi(k)$, as needed. □

Lemma 3.7. *If $p \nVdash \phi$ then there is a $q \preceq p$ such that $q \Vdash \neg\phi$.*

Proof. By induction on ϕ. This is immediate when ϕ is Δ_0. If $p \nVdash \exists x \psi(x)$ then there is a $q \preceq p$ such that for every k and every $r \preceq q$, $r \nVdash \psi(k)$. Therefore by the inductive hypothesis, $q \Vdash \neg\psi(k)$ for every k, and therefore $q \Vdash \forall m \neg\psi(k)$, as desired.

If $p \nVdash \forall x \psi(x)$ then there is a k such that $p \nVdash \psi(k)$, and so by the inductive hypothesis, there must be some $q \preceq p$ such that $q \Vdash \neg\psi(k)$, so $q \Vdash \exists x \neg\psi(k)$. □

Lemma 3.8. *Suppose $m < n$, $q \preceq p$ and $q \Vdash \phi$ where ϕ is a Σ_{m+1} formula. Then there is a $q' \preceq_m p$ so that $q' \Vdash \phi$.*

Proof. By induction on m. Suppose $m = 0$ and $q \Vdash \exists x\phi(x)$; we may fix an $r \preceq q$ and a k so that $r \Vdash \phi(k)$. Since forcing a Δ_0 formula depends on boundedly many values of ν^r, we may find a $q' \preceq_0 p$ by taking $\chi^{q'}$ to agree with ν^r on these values, and therefore $q' \Vdash \phi(k)$, so $q' \Vdash \exists x\phi(x)$.

For $m > 0$, suppose $q \Vdash \exists x\forall y\phi(x, y)$ where ϕ is a Σ_{m-1} formula. We may fix an $r \preceq q$ and a k so that $r \Vdash \forall y\phi(k, y)$. Consider $r \upharpoonright_m p$; if $r \upharpoonright p \Vdash \forall y\phi(k, y)$ then we are done since $(r \upharpoonright_m p) \preceq_m p$. Otherwise, by the previous lemma, there must be some $r' \preceq (r \upharpoonright_m p)$ such that $r' \Vdash \exists y\neg\phi(k, y)$, and by the inductive hypothesis, some such $q' \preceq_{m-1} (r \upharpoonright_m p)$.

Let $p' = r \upharpoonright_m p$. Then $q' \preceq_{m-1} p'$ and $r \upharpoonright p' = p'$, so Lemma 3.5 applies, and $q' \cup r$ is a condition. Since $q' \cup r \preceq q'$, we have $q' \cup r \Vdash \exists y\neg\phi(k, y)$. Since $q' \cup r \preceq r$, we have $q' \cup r \Vdash \forall y\phi(k, y)$. This is a contradiction, so $r \upharpoonright_m p \Vdash \forall y\phi(k, y)$. □

This implies that when $q \preceq p$ and $q \Vdash \phi$ where ϕ is a Π_m formula, there is a $q' \preceq_m p$ so that $q' \Vdash \phi$.

Let $\exists x\psi(x)$ be a Σ_m formula with $m < n$. By Lemma 3.7, $p \Vdash \exists x\psi(x)$ iff there is no $q \preceq p$ such that $q \Vdash \forall x\neg\psi(x)$, and this in turn is equivalent to there being no $q' \preceq_m p$ such that $q' \Vdash \forall x\neg\psi(x)$. Note that quantification over $q' \preceq_m p$ is internal, so by induction on the complexity of formulas, when $m < n$ and $\exists x\phi(x)$ is a Σ_m formula, the set of p such that $p \Vdash \exists x\phi(x)$ and the set of p such that $p \Vdash \forall x\exists y\phi(x, y)$ are both Π_{m+1}.

Lemma 3.9 **($I\Sigma_n$).** *For any p and any Σ_n formula $\exists y\phi(x, y)$, there is a $q \preceq_{n-1} p$ such that one of the following holds:*

- $q \Vdash \forall x\forall y\neg\phi(x, y)$,
- *There are a c and a k such that $q \Vdash \phi(c, k)$ and for every $c' < c$, $q \Vdash \forall y\neg\phi(c', y)$.*

Proof. Let p and ϕ be given. Consider the set of c such that there exists a $q \preceq_{n-1} p$ and a k with $q \Vdash \phi(c, k)$.

Suppose there is no such c. If $q \preceq p$ and $q \Vdash \phi(c, k)$ then, since $\phi(c, k)$ is a Π_{n-1} formula, there would be some $q' \preceq_{n-1} p$ such that $q' \Vdash \phi(c, k)$. So there is no such $q \preceq p$, and therefore $p \Vdash \neg\phi(c, k)$. Since this holds for every c, k, $p \Vdash \forall c\forall k\neg\phi(c, k)$.

Suppose there is such a c. Since the set of q such that $q \Vdash \phi(c, k)$ is given by a Π_{n-1} formula, the existence of such a q, k is a Σ_n formula, so there must be a least c such that there exist such a q, k. We choose some q and some k so that $q \Vdash \phi(c, k)$, and so $q \Vdash \exists x\phi(c, k)$. Suppose $q' \preceq q$ and there is a $c' < c$ such that $q' \Vdash \exists y\phi(c', y)$; then there would be an $r \preceq q'$ and a k such that $r \Vdash \phi(c', k)$, contradicting the leastness of c. So there is no such q', and so for every $c' < c$, each $q' \preceq q$ must have $q' \nVdash \exists y\phi(c', y)$, so $q \Vdash \forall y\neg\phi(c', y)$. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Again, by Theorem 3.2, it suffices to show that there is an X such that $\lim^n X = S$ and for every Σ_n formula $\phi(x, G)$ with parameters from $\mathfrak{M}$, the least number principle holds for $\{x \mid \phi(x, X)\}$. We construct an infinite sequence $p_1 \succ p_2 \succ \cdots$ such that:

- If $\exists x\phi(x)$ is a Σ_m formula with $m \leq n$ and $p_i \Vdash \exists x\phi(x)$ then there is a j and a k such that $p_j \Vdash \phi(k)$,
- For every Σ_n formula $\exists y\phi(x, y)$, either there is a j with $p_j \Vdash \forall x\forall y\neg\phi(x, y)$ or a c, k, i with $p_i \Vdash \phi(c, k)$,
- For each $r < n$, $\bigcup_i I_r^{p_i} = |M|$,
- $\bigcup_i I_n^{p_i} = |M|$ and when $s_n \in I_n^{p_i}$ then $\chi_*^{p_i}(s_n) = \chi_S(s_n)$.

Each of these families consists of countably many requirements, so it suffices to show that given any p and any individual requirement, there is a $q \preceq p$ satisfying the additional requirement. In order to avoid conflict with the fourth part, when satisfying the first three families, we must have $q \preceq_{n-1} p$.

For the first family, observe that if $p \Vdash \exists x\phi(x)$ then there must, by definition, be a $q \preceq p$ and a k with $q \Vdash \phi(k)$, and since $\phi(k)$ is a Π_{m-1} formula with $m - 1 < n$, we may take $q \preceq_{n-1} p$. The existence of $q \preceq_{n-1} p$ satisfying the second family is given by the preceding lemma. The existence of $q \preceq_{n-1} p$ satisfying the third family is trivial

For the final condition, we may take any $s_n \notin I_n^p$ and define q by $I_n^q = I_n^p \cup \{s_n\}$, adding realizations larger than any elements where χ^p is defined, and setting χ^q on the resulting sequence equal to $\chi_W(s_n)$.

Suppose we have such a sequence. We take $S = \{k \mid \exists i\ \nu^{p_i}(k) = 1\}$. We claim that if $\phi(G)$ is a Σ_n or Π_n formula and there is an i with $p_i \Vdash \phi(G)$ the $\phi(S)$ holds. We show this by induction on ϕ; when ϕ is Δ_0, this is immediate from the definition. Suppose $p_i \Vdash \exists x\phi(x, G)$; by the construction, there is a $j \geq i$ and a k so that $p_j \Vdash \phi(k, G)$, and so by IH, $\phi(k, S)$, and so $\exists x\phi(x, S)$. If $p_i \Vdash \forall x\phi(x, G)$ then for each k, $p_i \Vdash \phi(k, G)$, so by IH, $\phi(k, S)$ holds, and therefore $\forall x\phi(x, S)$ holds.

Together with the second requirement, this implies that the least number principle holds for $\{x \mid \phi(x, S)\}$ whenever ϕ is a Σ_n formula.

It remains to show that $\lim^n X = S$. We show by induction on r that $\lim^r X$ exists and for each $\vec{s}_{[n,r]}$, $\chi_{\lim^r X}(\vec{s}_{[n,r]}) = \chi_*^{p_i}(\vec{s}_{[n,r]})$ for some (and therefore every) i large enough that $\vec{s}_{[n,r]} \in I_r^{p_i}$. When $r = 1$, whenever $\vec{s}_{[n,1]} \in I_1^{p_i}$, we have $\nu^{p_i}(\vec{s}_{[n,0]}) = \chi_*^{p_i}(\vec{s}_{[n,1]})$ for coboundedly many values of s_0. Since for any $\vec{s}_{[n,1]}$ there is some p_i with $\vec{s}_{[n,1]} \in I_1^{p_i}$, the claim follows immediately.

Consider some $r > 1$ and some $\vec{s}_{[n,r]} \in I_r^{p_i}$; for every $s_{r-1} \geq V_r^{p_i}(\vec{s}_{[n,r]})$, there must be some j such that $\vec{s}_{[n,r=1]} \in I_{r-1}^{p_j}$, and therefore by the inductive hypothesis, $\chi_{\lim^{r-1} X}(\vec{s}_{[n,r-1]})$ exists and is equal to $\chi_*^{p_j}(\vec{s}_{[n,r-1]}) = \chi_*^{p_i}(\vec{s}_{[n,r]})$. Since this holds for every $\vec{s}_{[n,r]}$, and, given some $\vec{s}_{[n,r]}$, for coboundedly many s_{r-1}, the claim follows.

In particular, it follows from the fourth requirement that $\lim^n X$ exists and is equal to S. $\square$

4. Conservation over Fragments of Arithmetic

The results in the previous section make it easy to prove a number of results about Π^1_1-MAX($\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$).

Definition 4.1. $I \subseteq M$ is a *cut* if I is an initial segment of M closed under successor.

Theorem 4.2. *The set of Gödel numbers of formulas in* Π^1_1-MAX($\mathbf{RCA_0}+ I\Sigma_n$) *is* Π_2 *complete.*

Proof. It is easy to see that Π^1_1-MAX($\mathbf{RCA_0}+I\Sigma_n$) is Π_2: $\sigma \in \Pi^1_1$-MAX($\mathbf{RCA_0}+ I\Sigma_n$) exactly if σ is Π^1_2 and every for proof of a Π^1_1 formula in $\mathbf{RCA_0}+I\Sigma_n+\sigma$, there is a proof of that formula in $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$.

On the other hand, for any Π_2 sentence $\forall x\exists y\phi(x, y)$ with ϕ a Δ_0 formula, consider the Σ^1_1 sentence Φ:

> There exists a set X such that $\lim^n X$ is a cut and for any $x \in \lim^n X$, there is a $y \in \lim^n X$ such that $\phi(x, y)$ holds.

If $\mathbb{N} \models \forall x\exists y\phi(x, y)$ then whenever $\mathfrak{M}$ is a countable model of $\mathbf{RCA_0}+I\Sigma_n$, we may apply Theorem 3.3 to obtain a set extension $\mathfrak{M}'$ such that $\mathbb{N} = \lim^n S$ for some $S \in \mathcal{M}'$. Therefore $\mathfrak{M}' \models \Phi$. Since this holds for any countable model, by Lemma 2.3 it follows that $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n + \Phi$ is a Π^1_1 conservative extension of $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$.

On the other hand, if $\mathbb{N} \not\models \forall x\exists y\phi(x, y)$, there must be some n such that $\mathbb{N} \models \forall y\neg\phi(n, y)$. However $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n + \Phi$ implies $\exists y\phi(n, y)$; since $\mathbb{N} \models \mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$, it follows that $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n \not\vdash \exists y\phi(n, y)$, so $\exists y\phi(n, y)$ is an arithmetic formula implied by $\mathbf{RCA_0}+I\Sigma_n+\Phi$ but not by $\mathbf{RCA_0}+I\Sigma_n$. □

Remark 4.3.

- This immediately answers Question 3.5 of [9]: Π^1_1-MAX($\mathbf{RCA_0}$) is not computably axiomatizable.
- If T is any theory which is not Π^1_1 conservative over $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$ then we may take any Π^1_1 formula θ with $T \vdash \theta$ but $\mathbf{RCA_0}+I\Sigma_n \not\vdash \theta$, and we could carry out the argument above using the formulas $\Phi \vee \theta$ (one can manipulate the quantifiers to get this into a strict Π^1_2 form). So the situation is also not simplified in the restriction to sentences provable in T. This answers Question 3.2 of [9].
- In particular, if θ is a true Π^1_1 formula not implied by $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$, the argument could be carried out using sentences $\Phi \vee \theta$, which are true.

A more complicated use of this method, together with an idea from [2], can answer Question 3.3 of [9]:

Theorem 4.4. *There is a* Π^1_2 *theory* T *which is a* Π^1_1 *conservative extension of* $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$ *and a nonstandard model* $\mathfrak{M}$ *which is not an* ω*-submodel of any model of* T*.*

Proof. Recall that a model M is *recursively saturated* if whenever $\langle \ulcorner \phi_i(x,\vec{y}) \urcorner \rangle$ is a computable sequence of Gödel numbers of (arithmetic) formulas and $\vec{a} \in M^{|\vec{y}|}$ is a tuple such that, for each n, $M \vDash \exists x \forall i \leq n \phi_i(x,\vec{a})$, then there is an $m \in |M|$ such that $\forall i\, M \vDash \phi_i(m,\vec{a})$. (It does not change the notion if we replace recursive with Σ_1, an idea which will help us below.)

Consider the formula $\mathrm{Sat}(k, X)$ which states that X codes the satisfiability relation for formulas with Gödel number below k. That is, for $\ulcorner \phi \urcorner < k$, $\langle \ulcorner \phi \urcorner, \vec{a} \rangle \in X$ iff the usual Tarski conditions hold (if ϕ is atomic then only when $\phi(\vec{a})$ holds, if ϕ is $\exists x \psi$ then only if there is some m such that $\langle \ulcorner \psi \urcorner, \vec{a}^\frown m \rangle \in X$, and so on). This is an arithmetic formula. Write $X \upharpoonright k = \{(\ulcorner \phi \urcorner, \vec{a}) \in X \mid \ulcorner \phi \urcorner < k\}$.

We will encode a cut, W_0, and a satisfaction relation W_1 which satisfies $\mathrm{Sat}(k, W_1 \upharpoonright k)$ for every $k \in W_0$. We then wish to consider types relative to this cut: that is, we take an index e (not necessarily in W_0) and view it as defining a type, namely those $k \in W_0$ such that, for some m, $\{e\}(m) = k$. We can think think of a type as being "satisfiable" below some m if there is an x such that whenever $m' < m$ and $\{e\}(m')$ exists and belongs to W_0, $\langle \{e\}(m'), x \rangle \in W_1$. (Actually, we fix a tuple of parameters $\vec{a}$ in addition to the function $\{e\}$.) Recursive saturation is related to having an induction property for this notion: either there is an m so that the type is satisfiable below m but not $m+1$, or the type is fully satisfiable—there is a single x with $\langle \{e\}(m), x \rangle \in W_1$ whenever $\{e\}(m)$ exists and belongs to W_0.

More precisely, we consider the sentence Φ given by:

> There is a set $S = (S_0, S_1)$ such that, taking $W_0 = \lim^n S_0$ and $W_1 = \lim^n S_1$:
> (1) W_0 is a cut,
> (2) For $k \in W_0$, $\mathrm{Sat}(k, W_1 \upharpoonright k)$,
> (3) Let a tuple $\vec{a}$ and an element $e \in W_0$ be given; then either:
>   - There is an $m \in W_0$ and an x such that for every $m' < m$ such that $\{e\}(m')$ converges to a value in W_0, $\langle \{e\}(m'), (x, \vec{a}) \rangle \in W_1$, but there is no x' such that for every $m' \leq m$ such that $\{e\}(m')$ converges to a value in W_0, $\langle \{e\}(m), (x', \vec{a}) \rangle \in W_1$, or
>   - There is an x such that for every $m \in W_0$ such that $\{e\}(m)$ converges to a value in W_0, $\langle \{e\}(m), (x, \vec{a}) \rangle \in W_1$.

Let $\mathfrak{M}$ be recursively saturated; then if $W_0 = \mathbb{N}$ and W_1 is the actual satisfiability relation for M, the pair (S_0, S_1) will satisfy Φ. Therefore by Theorem 3.3, $\mathfrak{M}$ is an ω-submodel of a model of Φ.

Conversely, suppose $\mathfrak{M} \vDash \Phi$ and let $\langle \ulcorner \phi_i(x,\vec{y}) \urcorner \rangle = \langle \{e\}(i) \rangle$ be an actual computable sequence of formulas (that is, $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $\{e\}(i)$ exists and belongs to $\mathbb{N}$) and let $\vec{a}$ be such that for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $M \vDash \exists x \forall i \leq n \phi_i(x, \vec{a})$. The definition of satisfiability is unique for actual formulas, and since $\{e\}(i)$

converges to an element in $\mathbb{N} \subseteq W_0$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is an x so that for every $i \leq n$, $\langle \{e\}(i), (x, \vec{a}) \rangle \in W_1$. Consider the two cases given by condition (3); in the first case, let x and m be given so that for every $m' < m$ such that $\{e\}(m')$ converges, $\langle \{e\}(m'), (x, \vec{a}) \rangle \in W_1$. We cannot have $m \in \mathbb{N}$ since the sequence is finitely satisfiable, so $m > \mathbb{N}$. But then $\langle \{e\}(n), (x, \vec{a}) \rangle \in W_1$ for all n.

In the second case, it is immediate that x is the desired witness. ☐

This method could also be used to produce a Π^1_2 sentence Φ' so that $\mathfrak{M}$ can be expanded to satisfy Φ' iff $(M, S_1, \ldots, S_n)$ is recursively saturated for any choice of finitely many $S_1, \ldots, S_n \in \mathcal{M}$.

5. CONSERVATION OVER $\mathbf{ACA_0}$

The work in this section is joint with Peter Cholak.

The method we used to show that Π^1_1-MAX($\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$) is Π_2 complete depended on the fact that in theories like $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_n$ there is a "mismatch" between the restrictions on possible sets placed by the axioms and our ability to describe sets using arithmetic formulas—that is, since the axioms all have low quantifier complexity, we were able to encode arbitrary sets by making sure they could only be decoded using formulas more complicated than the axioms. Over $\mathbf{ACA_0}$, we need a different technique.

The following argument from [1] provides inspiration:

Theorem 5.1. *There is a Σ^1_1 sentence false in the standard model which is Π^1_1 conservative over $\mathbf{ACA_0}$.*

Proof. A sentence σ, obtained using the fixed point lemma, is:

$$\exists\phi\exists X\left[\phi(X) \wedge \mathbf{ACA_0} + \exists X\phi(X) \vdash \neg\sigma)\right].$$

That is, σ says:

My negation is provable in $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ from a true Σ^1_1 sentence.

(We use here the fact that in $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ there is a Σ^1_1 truth predicate for Σ^1_1 sentences.)

This sentence is clearly false in the standard model, since if it were true, its negation would actually be provable, leading to a contradiction.

To see that σ is Π^1_1 conservative, suppose $\mathbf{ACA_0} + \sigma \vdash \forall X\neg\phi(X)$. Then $\mathbf{ACA_0} + \exists X\phi(X) \vdash \neg\sigma$. But, working in $\mathbf{ACA_0} + \exists X\phi(X)$, we see that $\exists X\phi(X)$ is true and that $\mathbf{ACA_0} + \exists X\phi(X) \vdash \neg\sigma$, so $\mathbf{ACA_0} + \exists X\phi(X) \vdash \sigma$ as well. This is a contradiction, so $\mathbf{ACA_0} \vdash \forall X\neg\phi(X)$, as desired. ☐

Theorem 5.2. *The set of Gödel numbers of formulas in* Π^1_1-MAX($\mathbf{ACA_0}$) *is Π_2 complete.*

Proof. We write $T \vdash_p \phi$ for the statement that p is the Gödel number of a proof of ϕ from the set of formulas T.

Given a quantifier free formula ψ, consider the following sentence σ_ψ obtained using the fixed point lemma:

$$\exists\phi\exists X\left[\phi(X)\wedge\forall y(\exists z\psi(y,z)\vee\exists p\leq y\ \mathbf{ACA_0}+\exists X\phi(X)\vdash_p\neg\sigma_\psi)\right].$$

This sentence says:

> Either $\forall y\exists z\psi(y,z)$ or the first counterexample gives a bound for a proof of my negation from $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ plus a true Σ^1_1 sentence.

Suppose $\mathbb{N}\vDash\forall y\exists z\psi(y,z)$ and that

$$\mathbf{ACA_0}+\sigma_\psi\vdash\forall X\neg\phi(X).$$

Then also

$$\mathbf{ACA_0}+\exists X\phi(X)\vdash\neg\sigma_\psi.$$

In particular, there is a natural number p which is the Gödel number of this proof, and so, together with the finitely many witnesses that when $y<p$ there is a z with $\psi(y,z)$, we obtain a finite number witnessing that

$$\forall y(\exists z\psi(y,z)\vee\exists p\leq y\mathbf{ACA_0}+\exists X\phi(X)\vdash_p\neg\sigma_\psi)$$

and therefore $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ proves this. But then $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\exists X\phi(X)\vdash\sigma_\psi$. Since $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\exists X\phi(X)\vdash\sigma_\psi\wedge\neg\sigma_\psi$, we have

$$\mathbf{ACA_0}\vdash\forall X\neg\phi(X),$$

showing that $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\sigma_\psi$ is Π^1_1 conservative over $\mathbf{ACA_0}$.

On the other hand, suppose $\mathbb{N}\vDash\exists y\forall z\neg\psi(y,z)$. Fix the least n such that $\mathbb{N}\vDash\forall z\neg\psi(n,z)$. If there is no $p\leq n$ such that $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\exists X\phi(X)\vdash_p\neg\sigma_\psi$ for some ϕ then $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\sigma_\psi\vdash\exists z\psi(n,z)$, an arithmetic statement which is false, and so not a consequence of $\mathbf{ACA_0}$. Suppose there is such a p; there are finitely many $p_1,\dots,p_k$ below n such that for each i there is a ϕ_i so that $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\exists X\phi_i(X)\vdash_{p_i}\neg\sigma_\psi$. Therefore $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\sigma_\psi+\forall z\neg\psi(n,z)$ must prove $\exists X\phi_1(X)\vee\cdots\exists X\phi_k(X)$. It follows that $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\sigma_\psi+\forall z\neg\psi(n,z)\vdash\neg\sigma_\psi$. This is a contradiction, so again $\mathbf{ACA_0}+\sigma_\psi\vdash\exists z\psi(n,z)$. ☐

6. CONCLUSION

We have not considered other fragments of $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ which have been studied in the literature. The most important other family of fragments are those given by the bounded collection scheme, $B\Sigma_n$.

Question 6.1. *Is* Π^1_1-MAX$(\mathbf{RCA_0}+B\Sigma_n)$ Π_2 *complete?*

The same question could be asked of other natural families of fragments of arithmetic, so we also wonder what the limits to this result are.

Question 6.2. *Is there a computably axiomatized fragment* T *of Peano arithmetic so that* Π^1_1-MAX$(\mathbf{RCA_0}+T)$ *is computable? Is there such a fragment with* Π^1_1-MAX$(\mathbf{RCA_0}+T)$ *computably enumerable? Is there such a* T *where the axioms have bounded quantifier complexity?*

Over $\mathbf{ACA_0}$ there is a known theory of Π^1_3, Π^1_2 conservative extensions (see [8]), some of it developed using techniques which inspired ideas in this paper (especially [2, 3]). Analogously to Π^1_1-MAX, there are maximal Π^1_{n+1}, Π^1_n conservative theories for all $n \geq 1$, and these theories are, by the same argument as for $n = 1$, Π_2.

Question 6.3. *Is the maximal Π^1_{n+1}, Π^1_n conservative extension of T Π_2 complete, for $n > 2$ and T either $\mathbf{RCA_0} + I\Sigma_m$ or $\mathbf{ACA_0}$?*

References

[1] Jeremy Avigad. Notes on Π^1_1-conservativity, ω-submodels, and the collection schema. Technical Report CMU-PHIL-215, Carnegie Mellon University, 2001.

[2] Jon Barwise and John Schlipf. On recursively saturated models of arithmetic. In *Model theory and algebra (A memorial tribute to Abraham Robinson)*, pages 42–55. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 498. Springer, Berlin, 1975.

[3] Jon Barwise and John Schlipf. An introduction to recursively saturated and resplendent models. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 41(2):531–536, 1976.

[4] Douglas K. Brown and Stephen G. Simpson. The Baire category theorem in weak subsystems of second-order arithmetic. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 58(2):557–578, 1993.

[5] Peter A. Cholak, Carl G. Jockusch, and Theodore A. Slaman. On the strength of Ramsey's theorem for pairs. *J. Symbolic Logic*, 66(1):1–55, 2001.

[6] Harvey Friedman. Systems of second order arithmetic with restricted induction, i, ii (abstracts). *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 41:557–559, 1976.

[7] Koichiro Ikeda and Akito Tsuboi. On conservativity for Π^1_2 theories. unpublished note, March 2007.

[8] Stephen G. Simpson. *Subsystems of second order arithmetic*. Perspectives in Logic. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2009.

[9] Keita Yokoyama. On Π^1_1 conservativity for Π^1_2 theories in second order arithmetic. In *10th Asian Logic Conference*, pages 375–386. World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2010.

Department of Mathematics, University of Pennsylvania, 209 South 33rd Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6395, USA

E-mail address: `htowsner@math.upenn.edu`

URL: `www.math.upenn.edu/~htowsner`